DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 421 775 EA 029 181

AUTHOR	Brown, Marie; Boyle, Bill; Boyle, Trudy
TITLE	The Effect of Decentralisation on the Shared Management Role of the Head of Department in Secondary Schools in England.
PUB DATE	1998-04-00
NOTE	19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Decentralization; *Department Heads; Foreign Countries; Interviews; Leadership Styles; *Management Teams; *Participative Decision Making; Pilot Projects; *Role Perception; *Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS	*England

ABSTRACT

This research examines how department heads in (British) secondary schools perceive their management roles and their access to the real decision-making power that occurs outside departmental confines, but within schools. In structured interviews, 30 department heads from 21 schools were encouraged to reflect on opportunities for collegial collaboration, use of cross-departmental planning models, correlation of departmental priorities with whole-school priorities, involvement in whole-school management roles, interrelationship of departmental and school budgets, departmental and whole-school evaluation policies, and related issues. Three distinct patterns of school management styles emerged, ranging from a high commitment to collegial decision making to few opportunities for shared management. Department heads of all three school types said they saw value in cross-departmental collaboration, but were not always asked to contribute meaningfully to extradepartmental planning decisions or to whole-school issues. A majority voiced cynicism about consultation exercises and dialoguing with their senior management team. The headteacher's centrality may impede improvement of school organization. Using the senior management team in more collaborative leadership patterns may extend middle-management team contributions. (Contains 14 references.) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 421 775

The Effect of Decentralisation on the Shared Management Role of the Head of Department in Secondary Schools in England.

**Presented at the American Educational Research Association (AERA)
1998 Annual Meeting April 13-17 1998 San Diego USA**

Dr. Marie Brown, Bill Boyle, Trudy Boyle

School of Education, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL. United Kingdom

Tel: (00 44)0161 275 3418 Fax: (00 44)0161 275 3552

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Boyle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA 029 181

The Effect of Decentralisation on the Shared Management Role of the Head of Department in Secondary Schools in England.

Presented at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) 1998 Annual Meeting April 13-17 1998 San Diego USA

Dr. Marie Brown, Bill Boyle, Trudy Boyle

School of Education, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL. United Kingdom

Tel: (00 44)0161 275 3418 Fax: (00 44)0161 275 3552

Objectives.

This paper reports on the evidence of shared management models emerging in a sample of secondary schools in England through examining:

the role of the head of department as a middle manager in the secondary school structure based on the norm of a traditional hierarchical model led by a Senior Management Team (SMT).

the relationships that exist and the communication of management information that takes place between Senior Management Teams and heads of department as a means of exploring the distance between the two management levels.

the involvement of heads of department in whole school decision making.

Context

In the secondary school system in England heads of department (or heads of faculty) are generally regarded as the middle management tier in a tripartite structure. This structure is traditionally hierarchical with at its top level, the headteacher or headteacher and senior managers eg the deputy headteachers, a secondary level of middle managers and a tertiary or grass roots level of classroom practitioners ie the teacher.

Critical national attention is now being focused on the role of these middle managers. Chris Woodhead, the Chief Inspector of Schools, in his 1997 report based on inspections of schools carried out by his OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education) inspection team during 1996-7 stated that

> *'the key role of middle managers – mainly heads of department with responsibility for other staff – was often underdeveloped. Too many heads of department saw their role as managers of resources rather than people. The role of middle managers in monitoring the quality of teaching was often ill-defined.'* (OFSTED 1997)

It is within the context of this critical scrutiny that this research is set. If middle management is viewed as a key role by OFSTED how close to whole school management decisions are the middle managers 'allowed'? This in turn leads to the supplementary question: What models of decision making structures exist in our secondary schools and do these enable middle

management to effect whole school decision making? The research seeks to identify the extent of or indeed the existence of any decentralised management models within our schools and the impact of those models.

Perspectives

Kanter (1997) drew attention to the fact that power inside the organisation as a whole, or within units of the organisation, is determined in part by 'connections with other parts of the system'. Teachers have traditionally been disconnected from other parts of the system whether that system consists of teachers in other classrooms, other schools or the central office. The development of productive power among teachers should involve providing greater opportunities to obtain useful information and resources in order to address issues and problems with others in the larger system (Kanter ibid).

'A movement towards true decentralisation is one alternative for improving the educational process for our twenty first century citizens. It is a necessary movement to improve school operation and improve education for students. It is an important step in the right direction. School site management strives to achieve collegial and collective management at the school level. Cross-faculty interaction arising from school based management committee work focuses on the school as a whole rather than on subjects or departments, thus bringing to teachers a wider perspective on educational issues. Focused talk about teaching tends to break down isolationist barriers and promote collegial interdependence. (Logan and Byers 1995)

In the ten years that have elapsed since the 1998 Education Reform Act (ERA), teachers in schools in England have been subjected to a plethora of macro, meso and micro policy swings and shifts. The extensive and unending succession of legislative, societal and cultural changes which have been characteristic of the educational environment since the late eighties have had significant effects upon both the operational and developmental activities of school leaders and managers (Boyle and Clarke, 1998). 'A principal quickly learns that if any change is to occur, it must be done through influence not control. Change occurs through an understanding of the culture of the school and an adoption of leadership behaviours that include supporting, directing, delegating and coaching.' (Alkire, 1993) Decentralisation in management has emerged through the Local Management of Schools and Grant Maintained School initiatives, while central control and accountability for teaching and learning have been emphasised through the National Curriculum and its associated assessments and the revision of the systems for inspection and training. Indeed Quality Control, Quality Assurance and Accountability became the key words of the late eighties and still remain so. This is a challenging agenda. The multiplicity of management tasks implicit in the comprehensive and radical policy shift outlined above has put heavy pressure on headteachers to delegate downwards. One of the purposes of this research is to seek to establish if that delegation reaches to, involves and empowers the middle management level. For example, a recent survey of 272 heads of department in secondary schools (Boyle, Christie, 1998) raised doubts about the involvement of heads of department in forward planning at the school level when 12% of that sample stated that they did not know whether any curriculum changes were being planned for the next academic year (1998-9).

Analyses of educational change have frequently been trapped within the dichotomy between structure and agency, either concentrating on the effects of structural movement or the strategies of individual actors (Ball, 1987). As theory veers from macro to micro, the meso level of organisational politics has often been neglected by researchers. However, we argue that in

an era of market forces in education it is even more important to focus on the meso (head of department) level as an important bridge between agency and structure in education. In schools the differing degrees of control at different management levels have been accentuated by the accumulation of institutional powers to headteachers since 1988 alongside the curtailing of such powers that main grade teachers possessed. This has led to the generation of a new discourse of strong leadership which in turn has tended to legitimise hierarchical, autocratic models of management. This is not just an issue in England as studies by Siskin (1993) have shown this to be also a significant concern in the United states of America. 'The move is away from the rigid, rules and control orientated bureaucratic hierarchies to looser, more informal, value driven organisations that are more responsive to their local markets and environments.' (Robertson 1994). Through an exploration of the management role of thirty heads of department in 21 secondary schools, this paper explores both the extent to which heads of department perceive that their management role extends to the whole school and beyond the department and to what extent they have real access to decision making across the school.

Methodology

This research has looked at how heads of department in secondary schools perceive their management roles and their access to the real power of decision making that takes place outside the confines of their department but within the school. This approach was considered more appropriate in what is essentially a small scale, pilot study. The research has focused on a sample of 30 heads of department, 24 of these were drawn from 20 secondary schools in the North West of England with the remaining six heads of department representing one school in the south Midlands. The schools in the North West were located in a range of urban areas, drawing from catchments that include a mix of public and private housing. They were chosen as the original sample because they matched the requirements of a mixed urban sample and the fact that the University of Manchester was already working with them in other partnership activities enabled ready access for interviewing purposes. The school in the south Midlands was set in a rural environment and provided both a contrasting locational context and the opportunity for a within-school case study across a small group of heads of department. The sample included variables of size across type (see below) of school. The analysis of the interview data evidenced that each of the three types that emerged encompassed the range of 500 to 1000 plus pupils.

In a series of structured interviews with the sample of 30 heads of department, they were encouraged to reflect and their responses to the following issues were noted:

- opportunities for collaboration with other heads of department
- planning models used across departments
- the extent that departmental priorities are correlated with whole school priorities
- opportunities for access to whole school decision making
- the extent that heads of department are involved in whole school management roles
- the inter-relationship of departmental and schools budgets
- departmental and whole school policies on appraisal and evaluation
- models of existing mechanisms for Senior Management and Heads of Department to identify jointly areas of concern
- the extent to which school management is hierarchical and autocratic or democratic and shared
- the professional development of middle managers

The interviews were recorded (**see appendix 1**) and transcribed. The transcripts were analysed by coding the information into categories. These categories tracked a continuum, from schools which showed no evidence of a shared management model to those which were operating fully in this way. There was continual reference back to the transcripts to ensure that all comments and observations were being incorporated. The heads of departments' views were frequently thoughtful and self-reflective and expressed a wide range of opinions on the ways in which decisions were made in departments and in schools, the access of heads of departments to whole-school decision making and the relationship between the heads of departments and the Senior Management Team. Where there were areas of agreement, these served to emphasise an issue, while areas of diversity encouraged us to look for underlying influences.

Data and Issues

From the interview data, across the sample of 30 heads of department three distinct patterns emerged in the styles of management in the schools in which they worked **(see appendix 2)**. These have been classified as types A, B and C for the purposes of this reporting paper.

Through analysis of all the sample responses type A schools emerged as demonstrating:

- a commitment to (with the necessary systems in place) regular formal opportunities for collaboration with other heads of department and colleagues from different subject areas
- their departmental priorities correlated closely with the School Development Plan with themes and issues identified and agreed collectively
- the presence of whole school committees or curriculum working parties with representation from the whole teaching body
- that the chairing of whole school committees extended to all members on a democratic rolling programme basis
- that heads of department were actively involved and consulted in whole school policy and decision making and consequently perceived that the headteacher saw them as having a wider whole school management role
- that heads of department were involved in evaluating the senior management team
- that these heads of department described their management structure as collegiate.

Type B schools demonstrated:

- less frequent formal opportunities for collaboration with other heads of department
- few meetings with colleagues in other departments
- they were generally unaware of other departments' planning models
- that everyone saw value of cross departmental collaboration
- the close linkage of department and whole school priorities
- that they believed that they were viewed by the headteacher as having whole school management roles and were involved in whole school policy decision making
- some involvement in the School Development Plan other than their own department's aspects
- positive opinions/perceptions of the management model's development towards a more co-operative horizontal model.

Type C schools demonstrated

- little formal collaboration between heads of department and less or no co-operative working with other staff colleagues
- no knowledge of other department planning models
- some belief in cross departmental collaboration
- a wide divide between the role of the senior management team and heads of department
- little evidence of whole school committees for curriculum and management
- that senior management perceived that heads of department had no whole school management role
- that most heads of department were not consulted on whole school decisions
- that department and whole school priorities were not closely linked
- that the school management structure was hierarchical with no access to evaluating the senior management team.

A selection of the interview responses clarifies and further defines these classifications.

Type A

- a commitment to regular formal opportunities for collaboration with other heads of department and colleagues from different subject areas

  'discussions regarding monitoring and evaluation have meant the sharing of departmental planning models'
  'we collaboratively plan across departments and this includes assessment, reporting and marking schemes'
  'across department collaboration is essential to utilise staff expertise and to ensure key skills are covered across the curriculum and opportunities for curriculum reinforcement are maximised but not duplicated.'
  'means reduction of curriculum overlap, increase in curriculum support when delivering the national curriculum and most importantly it means sharing good practice.'
  'across department collaboration is the most important so that we don't reinvent the wheel, we share ideas and see that the development work progresses in parallel.'
  'learning from each other improves the quality of teaching, helps with assessment and builds a more definable picture of the students' abilities and needs.'

- their departmental priorities correlated closely with the School Development Plan with themes and issues identified and agreed collectively

  'we work on the whole school action plan first then develop the department action plan, with regular weekly discussions on aspects and issues that arise.'
  'whole school issues are identified and discussed at management and governors residential weekends. These are then incorporated into the department plans.'
  'I contribute to the whole school development plan in a variety of aspects additional to my department element.'

- the presence of whole school committees or curriculum working parties with representation from the whole teaching body

'we have working parties who report back to faculties after consultation with the senior management team'
'there is a curriculum leaders team where priorities are identified and discussed and collaborative policies are produced and implemented. Best practice is identified in systems and procedure.'
'the school management team (includes representatives from all staff) meets weekly and is very open with published agendas and minutes.'

- that the chairing of whole school committees extended to all members on a democratic rolling programme basis

'no, chairing by the senior management team is discouraged, some committees rotate the chair'
'working groups have a joint approach or moving chair or chair which is not senior management'
'each member of staff rotates the chair'
'chair and minutes are on a rolling programme'

- that heads of department were actively involved and consulted in whole school policy and decision making and consequently perceived that the headteacher saw them as having a wider whole school management role

'yes I'm given whole school responsibilities and opportunities for developing my management experience in an acting senior teacher role'
'the opportunities are there for individuals to be pro-active, raise issues and they will be heard'
'yes I have a large input into whole school decision making and school policy'

- that heads of department were involved in evaluating the senior management team

'yes with regard to specific projects for example choice of inset and training needs, leadership and management styles used within a project'
'we reciprocally evaluate each other'
'although there is no formal process we all work together so closely regularly and openly with the head and deputy headteacher that it is not an issue'

- that these heads of department described their management structure as collegiate

'I work collegially with the senior management team through faculty forum identifying areas of concern. The system emphasises whole school working parties as an integral part of the structure'
'the management structure is hierarchical regarding responsibilities but collegiate regarding proposals, initiatives, development and evaluation of projects'
'we have an open management team with shared collaborative management throughout'
'all staff are form tutors including the headteacher who teaches regularly in the English dramatic arts faculty and is very approachable, open and has set up specific systems to share the school decision-making'

A summary comment for type A is provided by:

'Teamwork is the crucial ingredient for this school to be effective. There is no mystique and no feeling of intimidation. It is almost a collaboration of equals.'

The above head of department quote unconsciously echoes the research of Judith Warren Little (1990) who identified *'joint work'* as the strongest form of collegiality, most likely to lead to improvement.

Type B:

- less frequent formal opportunities for collaboration with other heads of department

'we have monthly management meetings for heads of department and senior management where we can write papers for inclusion in the agenda'
'we have half termly head of department meetings'

- few meetings with colleagues in other departments

'on staff inset days and at termly meetings with the headteacher to discuss department issues'
'we have no formal meetings to collaborate with colleagues in other departments'

- they were generally unaware of other departments' planning models

'no, not really'
'no but it would be interesting'
'yes faculty development plans are a set format'

- that everyone saw value of cross departmental collaboration

'it prevents becoming insularly department focused' (sic)
'we would get a wider perspective of the children's needs'
'we could share issues, prevent repetition, reinforce projects with other departments and discuss individual pupils for comparison'
'essential to support school ethos and the school development plan – seeding and sharing ideas, successes and failures, organisation of cross-curricular issues and basic skills support'
'saves time and energy and raises awareness of other departments so that we can support each other and share ideas'
'good preparation for OFSTED'

- the close linkage of department and whole school priorities

'very closely, since OFSTED we have tightened up'
'they're an integral part of the school development plan which was constructed with the departmental priorities stated from the outset'
'a necessity – department priorities are included in school development plan construction they are therefore an integral element'

- that most believed that they were viewed by the headteacher as having whole school management roles and were involved in whole school policy decision making

  'all middle management group are encouraged to participate via meetings and actively contribute to whole school decision making'
  'school policy has an open forum at staff meetings and all are encouraged to participate'
  'yes he makes it clear that the onus for change can come from middle management and he backs you – if it's in support of the school mission statement'
  'we are invited onto all the working parties about whole school issues and can give our views at middle management meetings'
  'yes but how much heads of department meetings affect policy change I don't know'
  'school policies are discussed at staff meetings in an open forum'
  'we are consulted democratically but the process is lengthy and can be frustrating'
  'at management meetings you can give your views'

- some involvement in the School Development Plan other than their own department's aspects

  'yes I'm shown draft copies of the school development plan for my comments'
  'senior management team write the initial draft but head of department input is encouraged'
  'shown the draft copies and if the maths faculty is referred to I discuss it with the curriculum deputy head'
  'draft school development plan is shown for comment initially'

- positive opinions/perceptions of the management model's development towards a more co-operative horizontal model

  In response to a question 'would you describe your school management structure as hierarchical?' all gave a qualified *'yes but ...'*
  'only in structure, communication up and down is fluid and open'
  'yes on paper but it is developing into a more co-operative model with lots of two-way access'
  'yes and no, because it's not intimidating, it is an accessible flatter model with a human face You feel listened to and involved'
  'yes but with many opportunities for involvement and contribution'

  'Termly head of department meetings with the headteacher have an open agenda and you feel able to discuss any issue freely. You are actively listened to in a relationship of trust'

  Type C responses

- little formal collaboration between heads of department and less or no co-operative working with other staff colleagues

  only informally'
  'academic committee meet every half term'
  'little other than formal head of department meetings but no organised meetings without senior management present'

'not a great deal. I would like more'
'very little, informal. On the corridor or in the staffroom'
'any head of department collaboration is almost stumbled upon by accident'

- no knowledge of other department planning models

'no but they are available in the office, but I don't have time to look through them'
'a school model is used'
'within faculty yes, but generally no'
'no except that we are meant to use a common template. I don't know whether other departments plan weekly or half termly'

- some belief in cross departmental collaboration

'ensures revisiting of core skills in a planned manner'
'thoughtful relevant planning could be made – but it doesn't happen!'
'gives a wider view of the pupils and we could collaborate about individuals'
'I see a lot of value in it because it has the potential to assist pupils in seeing the totality of the curriculum, that lessons and subject knowledge are linked in various ways. Also skill transference may develop faster through collaboration.'
'great value particularly in terms of delivering the same messages eg standards of behaviour'
'gives middle management more say/involvement in what happens in the whole school rather than having it imposed top-down'
'can map effectively teaching to prevent overlap and make learning more meaningful'

- a wide divide between the role of the senior management team and heads of department and that department and whole school priorities were not closely linked

'there's a lack of consultation – you feel undervalued'
'correlating department priorities with whole school priorities isn't done closely, we prepare our own plans which are viewed by the senior management team'
'we write our priorities generally in the direction of the school development plan but the faculty is very much a 'stand-alone' one'
'department plan is written in isolation'
'department priorities come first – then I try to make them fit the school development plan'
'the department plan is written separately, given to the senior management team – then it disappears!'

The four heads of department who responded that priorities were closely matched between department and school, all interestingly stated that this matching was the sequitur of OFSTED reports.

'yes systems are set up this way since OFSTED'
'significantly follows LEA whole school development plan format and OFSTED action plan'

- little evidence of whole school committees for curriculum and management (where there was, it was perceived by the heads of department as a token gesture and in each case the chair is a member of the senior management team)

'yes it meets once a year'
'there is a behaviour committee'
'heads of department can produce papers and discuss and theoretically put ideas into practice'
'we have a staff council where the agenda is 'open' but generally set by the headteacher. It frequently has the feel of an information giving forum rather than a policy forming body. Sometimes the senior management team negate and limit the discussion by undertaking to consult privately with individuals or have already consulted the relevant head of department before the meeting'

- that senior management perceived that heads of department had no whole school management role (and those who did were ambivalent in their responses)

'no I'm rarely consulted'
'the headteacher definitely does not see me as having a whole school management role – it is unheeded dialogue – staff influencing the dialogue has lessened'
'only when it suits them. convenient use of my skills when it's deemed appropriate but not if I'm likely to rock the boat'
'he says he does'
'yes in my job specification I'm responsible for whole school display and organising trips – setting a high profile for the school'

- that most heads of department were not consulted on whole school decisions (with those who were, being sceptical about their role)

'no because mention made during head of department or staff meetings does not lead me to be fully involved'
'yes but not at a level which really matters'
'in some cases but the headteacher likes his own tight control'
'yes to some extent but increasingly decisions have already been made – tacit expression of opinion – the door is almost closed before asking'

- that the school management structure was hierarchical with no access to evaluating the senior management team

'yes definitely'
'yes but I wish it wasn't and democracy would ring – it's too doctrinaire, not enough discussion and too many statements'
'there is no formal upwards evaluation – I'd like to see that happen'
'not formally. I wish I did'

Further issues

Two issues from the data were not covered within the types A-C classifications. One was the whole sample issue of professional development and the other was the case study which was enabled by six heads of department interviewed within the one school.

Across the sample of thirty schools there was no evidence of structured whole school guidelines on professional development for heads of department, although in all but one school there was a whole school appraisal scheme (mostly based on a local authority model). In the one without such a scheme, it was stated that the headteacher was waiting for national guidelines, but that head of department's added comment was: 'are there any coming? it's very frustrating'. Two of the schools identified their heads of department's professional development needs through the appraisal process while one (from the sub-group of the six type B schools) used a Personal Training Record in which the teacher identified his/her professional needs each term; the prioritising and operationalising of strategies to meet these identified needs was then the responsibility of a designated senior management team member. In responding to the sub-question of whether these heads of department saw the professional development agenda as a departmental issue, one from the type C category stated that 'departments should have more influence on professional development issues' while another declared 'it is a whole school issue'. Overall the sample's responses to the provision of structured professional development support could be best summarised by 'there are no guidelines for professional development and support' and 'it is reduced to a policy of first come first served'.

In the case study ie the six heads of department within one school there were interesting contextual issues. The headteacher had only been in situation for just over a year and had inherited management level 'point allocation' complications of a recent amalgamated school. She had strongly and successfully guided the school through an OFSTED inspection shortly after her arrival and then set about restructuring management on a more equitable basis. This restructuring seemed to have been, from her own testimony and the interview evidence from the heads of department, without the use of consultation. Unfortunately this recent history fresh in the minds of the interviewees gave the school responses a strong leaning towards type C, when in fact the medium term movement may well be towards a more horizontal style – only time will tell and a further visit is planned. One indicator was that the newest management recruit interviewed, an appointment of the new headteacher, was very positive about his perception of his own potential management involvement within the whole school.

In summary certainly those classified as type B schools and possibly even a minority of type C appeared to be hierarchical structures which could eventually move more towards 'flatter' models. Encouragingly heads of department of all the three types expressed the opinion that they saw value in cross-departmental collaboration. However, they were aware that they were not always asked to contribute meaningfully to extra-departmental planning decisions or to whole school issues other than their own department's aspects of the School Development Plan. Across the sample of thirty heads of department there was still a majority voicing unhealthy cynicism about both consultation exercises and the concept of dialogue with their senior management team. The hierarchical overtones of 'I do as I'm told' and 'senior management team control the agenda' were still much in evidence. The distance between the present situation and any real horizontal management model should not be underestimated.

Conclusions

School Effectiveness research tells us that successful school practices are those which result in improved organisational learning which is "dependent on individuals improving their mental models" (Kim, 1993). Our concern in this research was directed to the "mental models" of heads of department, i.e. their self-perception concerning how they ought to function and what they do, given their specific whole-school contexts.

Middle management at its best fits leadership styles grounded in an organic organisational philosophy where middle managers function as communicating links between the SMT and the teachers, as support agents for teachers in their daily work and as stimulating forces to the improvement of teaching and learning in the school. Middle management means different things in an organically organised school than in a mechanistic hierarchically organised one.

Schools can no longer rely on hierarchical and autocratic forms of management. Recent research by Wallace and Hall (1994) demonstrates that secondary headteachers have as much to lose as gain when they commit themselves and colleagues to a team approach to managing the school. Torrington and Weightman (1989) found the extraordinary centrality of the headteacher in British schools to be a main impediment to improving school organisation. While headteachers are 'central players' (Hall and Southworth, 1997) the suggestion from that research is that there are strong indicators that this situation is altering. They perceive an increasing reliance on shared leadership in schools leading to its distribution downwards from the senior management team. This, Hall and Southworth suggest, might point up the increased complexity in school management and leadership where the challenges may be too great for any one individual due to an expansion in the volume of tasks required by the job. The use of senior management team in more collaborative leadership patterns may lead to an extension of the contributions of the middle management team. There still remains however the issue of maintaining a balance between organisational control and staff participation and involvement. Our pilot research would suggest that despite the rhetoric not many headteachers have succeeded in achieving the desired equilibrium.

If head teachers are to be transformational, they must encourage collegiality and communication at all levels in their schools and positively so through the use of formalised structures (Boyle and Clarke ibid). What we have seen in our research to-date is the beginning of such a realisation and a tentative move in this direction in some schools. Where such collaboration crossed departmental lines, it positively affected staff cohesion, a view also expressed by Sackney et. al. 1997. In sample schools, where such cohesion did not as yet appear to exist, few formalised structures were in place and members of the senior management appeared to be interested only in maintaining the status quo rather than exploring alternative models. More collegially-minded schools appeared to consider shared decision making to be almost a natural part of the school structure, management issues were shared amongst the staff and decisions were made by those who were affected by them.

Based on our interviews and research so far, we are beginning to see an emergent paradigm of three different levels of shared management in schools, with the top level based on common values, common understandings and common priorities. These different levels may warrant the status of predictive attributes and will need further investigation.

REFERENCES

Alkire, G J. *Shared Leadership: Beyond Boundaries.* Thrust for Educational Leadership 1993 22 pp 28-31.
Ball, S. J. (1987) *The Micropolitics of the School: Towards a Theory of School Organisation.* London: Routledge.
Boyle, B & Clarke P (1998) *The Headteacher as Effective Leader* Aldershot Ashgate.

Boyle, B & Christie T (1998) *SSP Secondary Curriculum Survey* London QCA pp6-7
Hall V & Southworth G (1997) *Headship. School Leadership and Management* Vol 17 No 2 pp.151-170.
Kanter R.M. (1997) *Men and Women of the Corporations* pp 164-205, New York, Basic Books.
Kim, D. (1993). The link between individuals and organisational learning. *Sloan Management Review*, 35 (1), 37-50
Little,J.W. (1990) *The persistence of privacy: autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations*, Teachers College Record, 91 (4) 509-36.
Logan, Joyce P and Byers Charles W. *School-Based Decision Making: Implications for Vocational Education and for the Decision-Making Process*, Journal of Vocational Educational Research, 1995 Vol 20 no.1 pp 35-54.
Robertson, Peter J. and Kwong, Sophia S, *Decision Making in School-Based Management Leadership Councils: the Impact of Council Membership Diversity* The Urban Review 1994 Vol 26 no.1. pp 41-55.
Sackney, L. et al (1997). "Shared leadership: A Requisite for School Improvement". Paper presented at the Tenth International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement. Memphis, Tennessee.
Siskin, L. (1993) " Hermaphroditic Roles: teacher leadership in secondary schools". Paper presented to the International Study Association on Teacher Thinking, Gothenburg, Sweden
Torrington D & Weightman J (1989) *The Reality of School Management* Oxford Blackwell
Wallace M & Hall V (1994) *Inside the SMT: teamwork in secondary school management*. London Paul Chapman

Interview data

Sample size: 30 heads of department across 21 schools.
Typology of management models:
Type A: horizontal in its integration of senior and middle management and maingrade teachers;
Type B: degrees of movement from a hierarchical to a horizontal model;
Type C: vertical hierarchical model of 'top down' management decisions.

1. Do you have collaboration opportunities with other heads of department?

	Weekly	Monthly	Half term	term	rare/never
Type A	2	2	0	0	0
Type B	0	4	2	0	0
Type C	0	8	6	1	5
Total	2	14	8	1	5

2. Do you collaborate with colleagues in other departments?

	Formal			Staff dev. day	informal	none
	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Half termly			
Type A	2	2	0	0	0	0
Type B	0	0	1	2	0	3
Type C	0	0	2	1	8	9
Total	2	2	3	3	8	12

3. Do you know other department planning models?

	Yes	No	One other	School model
Type A	2	0	0	2
Type B	1	4	0	1
Type C	1	16	2	1
Total	4	20	2	4

4. Do other departments plan collaboratively?

	Yes	Some	No	Don't know	I.T.
Type A	4	0	0	0	0
Type B	0	2	0	2	2
Type C	0	6	13	0	1
Total	4	8	13	2	3

5. Is there a common school planning model?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Type A	3	1	0
Type B	1	5	0
Type C	4	15	1
Total	8	21	1

6. How closely are departmental and whole school priorities correlated?

	Closely	Fairly closely	Somewhat	Not at all
Type A	3	1	0	0
Type B	5	1	0	0
Type C	4	0	6	10
Total	12	2	6	10

7. Does your school have a whole school committee/working party for management of the curriculum?

	Yes	No
Type A	4	0
Type B	1	5
Type C	7	13
Total	8	18

8. Are the chairs of committees or working parties always either the headteacher or a member of the SMT?

	Yes	No	Not applicable
Type A	0	4	0
Type B	2	1	3
Type C	17	0	3
Total	19	5	6

9. **Does the headteacher see you as having a management role across the whole school as well as within your department?**

	Yes	No	Sometimes
Type A	4	0	0
Type B	4	2	0
Type C	4	14	2
Total	12	16	2

10. **Do you feel actively involved or consulted in school policy decision making?**

	Yes	Perhaps	Sometimes	No
Type A	4	0	0	0
Type B	4	2	0	0
Type C	0	3	1	16
Total	8	5	1	16

11. **How are you involved in developing elements of the School Development Plan?**

	WS work party & Dept	Comment on SDP	Only Dept element
Type A	4	0	0
Type B	0	4	2
Type C	1	2	17
Total	5	6	19

12. **Do heads of department evaluate the Senior Management Team?**

	Yes	No but	No
Type A	2	2	0
Type B	0	0	6
Type C	0	0	20
Total	2	2	26

13. **Is there any mechanism for heads of department and SMT to jointly identify areas of concern?**

	Yes	No
Type A	4	0
Type B	6	0
Type C	7	13
Total	17	13

14. Would you describe the management structure of your school as hierarchical?

	Yes	Yes but	No
Type A	0	0	4
Type B	0	6	0
Type C	20	0	0
Total	20	6	4